



The Martyria of Odense and a Twelfth-Century Russian Prayer: The Question of Bohemian Influence on Russian Religious Literature

Author(s): John H. Lind

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 68, No. 1 (Jan., 1990), pp. 1-21

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4210165>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 16:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW

Volume 68, Number 1—January 1990

The Martyria of Odense and a Twelfth-Century Russian Prayer: The Question of Bohemian Influence on Russian Religious Literature

JOHN H. LIND

I

IN 1884 A. S. Arkhangel'skii published a text from a fifteenth-century manuscript which has alternately been called the *Prayer to the Holy Trinity* or Kirill Turovskii's *Prayer of Penitence* (*Molitva Kirilla Turovskogo o pokaianii*). In the middle of this rather verbose narrative is a Litany of Saints (pp. 12–14), which is of considerable scholarly interest because it mentions a number of saints not ordinarily associated with the Orthodox Church.

The fact that the text is written in 'pure colloquial Russian' ('chisto russkii, razgovornyi') yet lists saints 'unknown to Russian Orthodox hagiography' led Arkhangel'skii to conclude that the prayer was both Russian and non-Russian in origin. He also challenged the attributions of the text made in some manuscripts to 'Kirill Filosof, uchitel' Slovenom a Bolgarom' and to John Chrysostom, both of whom were mentioned in the litany. The commonplace 'in all the seven millennia there was neither among the living nor the dead a sinner like the cursed me' led Arkhangel'skii to date the prayer to the fifteenth century.¹

John H. Lind presently writes on the history of the Finno-Ugrian peoples at the Department of Finnish, University of Copenhagen.

¹ A. S. Arkhangel'skii, 'Liubopytnyi pamiatnik russkoi pis'mennosti XV veka', *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti*, 50, St Petersburg, 1884, pp. 1–19. Text edited from MS in the Library of the Moskovskaia Dukhovnaia akademiia, no. 332, with variants from MS no. 319 of the same Library.

I. A. Shliapkin responded to the publication of the prayer by publishing a parchment fragment in his possession dating from the thirteenth or fourteenth century. In addition to rejecting Arkhangel'skii's dating of the prayer he expressed his doubts that such saints as SS Viacheslav, Voitekh, Magnus, Canute, Alban, Olaf, and Botulf would have been mentioned alongside SS Boris and Gleb, Cyril and Methodius in the fifteenth century. Shliapkin observed that his fragment omitted the names of SS Magnus, Canute, and Alban and concluded that his text, and those of Arkhangel'skii's edition, had to derive from an even older original, and he was inclined to date the prayer much earlier. Noting the deaths of SS Voitekh-Adalbert († 997), Olaf of Norway († 1000 [i.e. Olaf Tryggvason]), Boris and Gleb († 1015), Magnus († 1047 [i.e. the son of St Olaf Haraldson, and king of Denmark and Norway]), Alban († 1072 [sic!]) and Canute († 1086), Shliapkin dated the prayer to the eleventh to twelfth century, a time 'when there was still no sharp religious discord between East and West'. Such Russianisms as 'Olena, ozhe etc.' and the petition 'pomiani sego blagovernago kniazia nashego imrk i bratiiu ego i vsiu oblast' ikh i ottsa i mater'' indicated to Shliapkin the Russian provenance of the prayer, although he allowed for the possibility that they were later interpolations.²

In 1910 the prominent linguist and literary historian A. I. Sobolevskii re-edited Shliapkin's fragment together with the so-called *Prayer against the Devil*, a text he considered to be a translation from Latin, under the joint title *Russian Prayers Mentioning Western Saints*. Sobolevskii discovered that the *Prayer to the Holy Trinity* shared a number of linguistic features and phrases with other prayers in the codex containing the *Prayer against the Devil*. These features, together with the presence of saints such as SS Magnus, Canute, Olaf, Alban, Botulf, Kandela, Victoria, Vitus, the Popes Linus, Anacletus, Clement, Sylvester, and Leo, alongside SS Cyril and Methodius, Viacheslav and Voitekh (who was venerated exclusively by the Western Church), suggested to Sobolevskii that the *Prayer to the Holy Trinity* had also been translated from Latin in Bohemia, an area that, though under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Rome, used Church Slavonic as a liturgical language. As both 'Canute and Alban died in the second half of the eleventh century (the first in 1086, the second in 1072 [sic!]),

² I. A. Shliapkin in *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, 1884, Dec., Part 236, pp. 267–69.

these prayers belong to the period of Prokop Cheshskii's activity and the prime of the Sázava Monastery'.³

This point was later taken up by Francis Dvornik, to whom we owe the most thorough studies and interpretations of this and similar texts. He returned to the question on several occasions in the course of his long scholarly career, initially in a lecture delivered to the Royal Historical Society in 1946,⁴ and later in *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, 1949,⁵ and the article 'Les Bénédictines et la christianisation de la Russie', 1954.⁶

Dvornik has no doubt that the prayer is of eleventh-century western origin and that it must have entered 'Kievan Russia from nowhere but the Przemyslide dominion'. This contention also rests on the catalogue of saints. Dvornik singles out 'SS Magnus, Canute, Olaf, Alban, Botulf, Martin, Victor, Vitus, the Popes Linus, Anacletus, Clement, and Leo, the saintly brothers Cyril and Methodius, SS Wenceslas and Vojtiekh (Adalbert)',⁷ to which the two SS Benedict are added in the 1954 essay.

³ A. I. Sobolevskii, 'II. Russkie molitvy s upominaniem zapadnykh sviatykh' in *Materialy i issledovaniia v oblasti slavianskoi filologii i arkhologii*, *Sbornik Otd. russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imp. A.N.*, 88, no. 3, St Petersburg, 1910, pp. 45–47. The texts in this edition were reprinted by F. W. Mareš in 'An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin', *Slavische Propyläen*, 127, Munich, 1979, pp. 64–70. Mareš, however, mistakenly describes Shliapkin's edition as including the 'full text' (like Arkhangel'skii's) whereas the same fragment published by Sobolevskii is only 'the most important part of the text containing the invocation of saints' (p. 69); Mareš seems not to have known the MS Description of 1976, cf. below.

⁴ F. Dvornik, 'The Kiev State and its Relations with Western Europe', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fourth Ser.* xxix, London, 1947, pp. 38–39; reprinted in R. W. Southern (ed.), *Essays in Medieval History*, London, 1968, pp. 13–15.

⁵ F. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, London, 1949, pp. 242–45.

⁶ In 1054–1954. *L'Eglise et les Eglises: Neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'orient et l'occident. Etudes et travaux sur l'unité chrétienne offerts à Dom Lambert Beauduin*, Chevetogne, 1954, pp. 326–27. Later Dvornik briefly reiterates his opinion in 'The Slavs. Their Early History and Civilization', in *Survey of Slavic Civilization*, vol. II, Boston, 1956 (second edn 1959), pp. 240–41; and in *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs. SS. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius*, New Brunswick, N.J., 1970, pp. 223–25.

⁷ In his reference to the three editions of the text (1949, p. 243, n. 21) Dvornik erroneously describes Sobolevskii's edition as having been made from a third copy, different from that published by Shliapkin. His further assertion that 'none but the MS published by Arkhangel'skii mentions the names of the Popes, whereas the two other versions leave out Linus and Anacletus and put the general invocation instead: O Holy Order of the Popes (*Sv. lik papezhiu*). After enumerating the Popes, the three versions add the Latin greeting — *Ave papa* — transliterated in Slavonic characters' is both confusing and wrong. If we view the two different texts in parallel:

Arkhangel'skii:
 молитвѣ Бога за мя грѣшнаго
 свѣтѣи ильинѣ папѣжу анклитъ
 и климентѣ селивестръ
 аве папа стефане . . .

Shliapkin:
 молитвѣ Бога за мя грѣшнаго
 свѣтѣи ликъ папѣжу
 климанте сививестре
 лве папа стефане . . .

we see that neither MS mentions Linus, as 'Il'in' in Arkhangel'skii's MS is certainly a scribal error; Shliapkin's MS indeed mentions the names of several popes; only one version contains 'Ave papa', which is probably also an easily understandable scribal error for 'Lve' as in the older MS. Surprisingly, Dvornik enumerates Leo among the popes in his catalogue at the same time claiming the presence of 'Ave' in all versions.

Initially dating the prayer to the end of the eleventh century, that is, subsequent to the deaths of SS Canute († 1086) and Olaf († 1072 [sic!]),⁸ Dvornik suggests that the choice of saints should help to date the composition of the prayer with greater precision. Thus St Magnus must be the Abbot of Fuesse who died in the mid-seventh century and had two *Lives*, written in the tenth and eleventh centuries respectively. SS Canute and Olaf present no problem. They are the royal saints of Denmark and Norway, whose cult must have spread rapidly to Germany, 'the part played in (the conversion of Denmark) by Hamburg would be enough to account for the popularity of those saints . . . This could explain the juxtaposition of these two Christian heroes with another German favourite saint in a prayer composed at the end of the eleventh century'. His assumption about the spread of SS Canute's and Olaf's cults to Germany led Dvornik to identify St Alban with the patron saint of Mainz, martyred in 406, who had a *Life* written c. 1062. St Botulf is the Anglo-Saxon saint from the seventh century, whose cult must have been revived in the tenth century, when King Edgar had his relics translated. St Martin can be none other than the Bishop of Tours, at that time still popular in Central Europe. St Victor should 'probably' be the martyr of Solothurn in Switzerland, venerated especially at St Gallen. 'Bearing in mind Bohemia's relations with Saxony, Mainz and Regensburg', Dvornik can now imagine 'how the devotion of these saints found its way into that country. It was there, then, that the prayer we are examining was, if not written, certainly translated from Latin into Old Slavonic, since such a selection of Germanic, Roman, and Slavonic saints could only have been made in eleventh-century Bohemia. There exists no acceptable reason for inventing direct penetration into Russia from Scandinavia'.⁹ The prayer is 'a curious instance of Christian interaction at a time when Eastern and Western Christianity are supposed to have drifted apart'. Following this forceful characterization, Dvornik reiterates one of his main leitmotifs: 'this is but another instance which calls for the radical revision of the generally accepted opinion of the Eastern Schism'.

⁸ I find no satisfactory explanation for this date which appears in Shliapkin and Sobolevskii as the date of death of St Alban and in Dvornik as that of St Olaf. The date is certainly not correct for any of the identifications suggested, as Olaf Haraldson died in 1030.

⁹ In his first published discussion of the text, Dvornik himself nearly invented 'direct penetration into Russia from Scandinavia' as he asserted 'the spread of the cult of Canute of Denmark and of the Norwegian King Olaf to Russia is not surprising, considering her many contacts with Scandinavia' and even offered source references (1947, p. 38; 1968, p. 14), which do not appear to support his 1949 argument for the spread of the cults to Germany.

The slavist A. P. Vlasto¹⁰ and the theologian G. Podskalsky¹¹ concur with this exposition, which, however, raises a number of serious doubts beginning with Dvornik's unsupported theory of an early spread of the cults of SS Canute and Olaf to Germany and thence to Bohemia. The cult of St Canute, the king martyred on 10 July 1086, arose at a time when the Danish King and Church were seeking to sever links with the German primate, the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen. This policy met with success in 1103, when Pope Pascal II granted the pallium to Bishop Asser of Lund as head of the newly-created Scandinavian ecclesiastical province. A few years earlier the same Pope sanctioned the translation of St Canute. Anglo-Saxon Benedictines were imported to the martyrrium at Odense for the propagation of the cult, thus prolonging the age-long competition between German ecclesiastical influence from Hamburg-Bremen and Anglo-Saxon influence from the England of Canute the Great. This lent St Canute's cult a pronounced anti-Hamburg-Bremen flavour and the cult was not likely to get off to an early start in Germany.¹² The cult of St Olaf did in fact spread to Germany, but only with the rise of the German Hansa, and only in towns on rivers running to the Baltic and North Seas¹³ — much too late to reach Bohemia in time for the Sázava Monastery possibly to provide an origin for a Church-Slavonic text.

II

Before considering this question further, we have to face the more fundamental textual problem posed by Shliapkin's observation that the

¹⁰ A. P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom*, Cambridge, 1970, p. 110. Vlasto finds the 'invocations to a long list of Western saints quite foreign to the Eastern Tradition . . . [they, together with the presence of] SS Cyril and Methodius, St Wencelas and St Adalbert underline the Bohemian origin of the whole prayer'.

¹¹ G. Podskalsky, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237)*, Munich 1982, p. 262: there the prayer is included in a group of texts, 'die eindeutig westlichen, und zwar inhaltlich und sprachlich böhmisch-mährischen Einfluss aufweisen'.

¹² All four texts arising in connection with the propagation of the cult between 1095 and c. 1120 (of which more later) seem to have been written by Anglo-Saxon clerics, cf. Aksel E. Christensen in *Danmarks historie*, 1, Copenhagen, 1977, pp. 255–58. The most recent treatments of these questions are C. Breengaard, *Muren om Israels Hus, Regnum et sacerdotium i Danmark 1050–1170*, Copenhagen, 1982, pp. 122–83; Tore S. Nyberg, *Die Kirche in Skandinavien. Mitteleuropäischer und englischer Einfluss im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert: Børglum und Odense*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 10, Sigmaringen, 1986. Cf. also E. Hoffmann, *Die heiligen Könige bei den Angelsachsen und den skandinavischen Völkern*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins, LXIX, Neumünster, 1975, pp. 101–39.

¹³ Among several pertinent papers presented at the Visby-Symposium 1979, K. Friedland, 'Sankt Olav als Schutzpatron nordeuropäischer Kaufleute', in *St. Olav, seine Zeit und sein Kult*, *Acta Visbyensia*, VI, Uddevalla, 1981, pp. 17–26, can be singled out. The cult of St Olaf could possibly have spread to Saxony much earlier, when Olaf's daughter (c. 1042) married Oduulf, son of Duke Bernhard. That marriage would not, however, have endeared the cult to Hamburg-Bremen, cf. Adam Bremensis, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae Pontificum*, in *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 11, Darmstadt, 1978, pp. 318–20; and we have no evidence that the cult did spread to Saxony.

text in his possession, the oldest available, omitted the names of SS Magnus, Canute, and Alban. Sobolevskii's and Dvornik's failure to make this observation places both in doubtful positions. Sobolevskii in fact dated the text he edited on the strength of the deaths of SS Canute and Alban, both missing in this text. Dvornik, believing Shliapkin's and Sobolevskii's edition to be made from two different manuscripts, both older than the two manuscripts consulted by Arkhangel'skii, placed himself inadvertently in a weak textological position, since none of the three names on which he constructed his Scandinavian–Bohemian link was in the two oldest manuscripts.

The textological question is an important one because the sequence in the late manuscripts of Arkhangel'skii's edition — 'Magnus, Canute, Benedict, Alban, Olaf, Botulf' — suggests a solution very different from Dvornik's. Here the key figure is St Benedict. Did he enter this context with the late interpolation of Magnus, Canute, and Alban, or did the original author intend him to stand between Canute and Alban? To solve this question a closer textological analysis seems necessary, especially in the light of the fact that a recent *Manuscript Description* gives conflicting information on this very point.

The parchment fragment of the prayer in Shliapkin's possession is currently located (under the signum Arkheogr. Kom. 162) in the collections of the Archaeographic Commission, which now belong to the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN) in Leningrad. In 1976 the Library published a description of parchment manuscripts from the eleventh to the sixteenth century in its holdings. Shliapkin's fragment is among the manuscripts described.

In the *Description* the fragment, consisting of two folios dated to the second half of the thirteenth century, is entered under the heading 'Molitva Kirilla Turovskogo o pokaianii'. The contents are characterized as part of a prayer which enumerates apostles and saints: amongst others, 'Kirill and Method, Boris and Gleb, Voitekh, Viacheslav (Cheshskii), Georgii Mitilenskii, *Magnus, Kanut, Alban*, and also the Roman Popes Kliment, Silvestr, Lev'.¹⁴ Thus the *Description* lists the three saints which according to Shliapkin's edition of the same text were omitted!

Obviously, Shliapkin's manuscript itself must be consulted if further progress is to be made. But first let us make a preliminary observation, which Shliapkin — and his successors — overlooked. A comparison of the relevant section of the texts published by Arkhangel'skii and Shliapkin shows that Shliapkin's manuscript did not merely omit the names. One of the texts must have substituted three names for three other names:

¹⁴ N. Iu. Bubnov, O. P. Likhacheva & V. F. Pokrovskaja (eds), *Pergamennye rukopisi BAN SSSR: Opisanie russkikh i slavianskikh rukopisei XI–XVI vv.*, Leningrad, 1976, p. 41.

Arkhangel'skii:

молите бога за мя грешна
 святыи перво мученниче . .
 . вячеславе магнуже конуте
 венедикте албане олове
 бутулве созоне . . . вси
 святии мученици . . .

Shliapkin:

молите бога за мя грешнаго
 святыи первомучениче . .
 . вячеславе мануиле савеле
 вендикте измаиле алове
 бутулве созоне . . . вси
 святии мученици . . .

On the surface, of course, the oldest manuscript should be given preference, but the three alternative names appearing in that manuscript do seem somewhat suspect in a list of martyrs, or even of saints.

It was not altogether surprising, after comparison with the manuscript itself, to find that Shliapkin's edition, and not the *Description*, is correct. Obviously the editor of the latter had relied on secondary literature for the contents of the manuscript. But a closer look at the manuscript text reveals that the matter is more complicated.

The fragment, as mentioned, consists of two folios. Each page has twenty-one lines, and the text quoted above is to be found on lines 20–21 on f. 2^r and line 1 on f. 2^v.

These lines read:

2 ^r	19	. . . ники
	20	то мино хфре вите вячеславе ма
	21	нуиле савеле вендикте измаиле
2 ^v	1	алове бутулве созоне романе анфиме

The first thing that strikes the eye when examining this text in the manuscript is that нуиле савеле and измаил, in line 21, are written by a different hand over an erased text¹⁵ and ве and the first stroke of н in вендикте have been redrawn. In other words the original text of line 21 may initially have read гнусе кануте вендикте албане. In fact, л in албане with the broad foot of the upstroke characteristic of the original scribe, can still be detected in the last part of м in измаиле, where we would expect to find албане. Likewise, the crossbar of н in албане can be detected although with less visibility.

III

The names of SS Magnus, Canute, and Alban, therefore, in all probability appeared in the original version of the prayer, and the original sequence read: Magnus, Canute, Benedict, Alban, Olaf, Botulf, etc. It is therefore appropriate to return to the identifications on which Dvornik based his Bohemian theory.

¹⁵ That the new text has been added by a different hand is seen by comparing the letters н (in the new hand like Latin N, rather than with a horizontal bar), л, а, and е. The м also differs from the original м, which was written with a bow between the poles, but this may be due to the later scribe's use of the pre-existing л in албане.

The main criticism that can be directed to Dvornik's identification is that he selects interesting names from different parts of the litany and treats them out of context.

The litany section of the prayer starts, in Shliapkin's fragment, on f. 1^r, line 18, with a general invocation to the Holy Virgin (Gospozha) to intercede with God for NN together with the hierarchy of heavenly powers. There follows an enumeration listing general categories of the hierarchy, but no specific names. Thereafter, on f. 1^v, line 12 the litany begins for a second time, invoking the heavenly powers to intercede for NN in the following order and with increasing specification:

Category 1: The Virgin;

Category 2: The Angels and Archangels;

Category 3: John the Baptist;

Category 4: The Apostles/Peter, Paul, etc;

Category 5: The Popes (a category not found in the general invocation)/[Anklit], Kliment, etc. (8 [9] names);¹⁶

This group also includes some names of martyrs, probably due to an early scribal error in a preceding copy [common to all known manuscripts].

Category 6: The Teachers and Prelates (uchiteli i sviatiteli)/Velikii Nikolai, Vasilii, etc. (13¹⁷ [17]);

Category 7: The Martyrs/Protomartyr Stefan, Georgii etc. (30 [29]);

Category 8: The Reverend Fathers (prepodobnye ottsy)/Iakim, Zakharii . . . Kuril, Mefedii, Vendikt (21 [20]);

Category 9: The Prophets/Il'ia, Isaia, etc. (20);

Category 10: The Holy Women/Anna etc. (47, Shliapkin's text breaks off after the third, Mar'[a]).

From his approach to the selection and identification of 'interesting' saints it is clear that Dvornik has endeavoured to create the impression of a Central European cluster which could form a link between more distant Scandinavian saints and the group of joint Western Slavonic saints including SS Cyril, Methodius, Viacheslav/Wenceslas, and Voitekh. But in identifying his selection of saints, Dvornik has failed to observe the category in which they appear in the litany. Let us reconsider his identifications.

Dvornik's catalogue of Western saints — SS Magnus, Canute, Olaf, Alban, Botulf, Martin, Victor, and Vitus — is followed by the group of popes and the group of Slavonic saints; and in his article in 1954 he also discusses the fact that Benedict's name is mentioned twice. Of these, Magnus, Canute, Olaf, Alban, Botulf, Vitus and one Benedict are all categorized among the martyrs in the prayer; Martin among the teachers and prelates; and Victor is nowhere to be found. Of the

¹⁶ Number in Shliapkin's fragment, [] number in Arkhangel'skii's edition, when different.

¹⁷ Probably due to haplography in Shliapkin's MS or a source.

Slavonic saints, Cyril and Methodius are placed among the reverend fathers; Voitekh in the group of priest- and bishop-martyrs, which was placed among the popes, probably in error.¹⁸ The second Benedict is mentioned among the reverend fathers. Furthermore, all the names from the group of martyrs, regrouped in Dvornik's catalogue, occur in one consecutive sequence in the prayer, '... Christopher, *Vitus, Wenceslas, Magnus, Canute, Benedict, Alban, Olaf, Botulf, Sozon, ...*', which could be significant for a correct identification.

Apart from St Victor of Solothurn's total absence, it is striking that three names in the list of martyrs by Dvornik are identified with saints who were not martyrs: Magnus with St Magnus, Abbot of Fuess; Benedict with either St Benedict of Aniane or St Benedict Bishop;¹⁹ Botulf with St Botulf, Abbot of Ikanhoe. It is also surprising to find Alban identified with St Alban of Mainz, rather than with his Anglo-Saxon fellow martyr and namesake, considering his proximity in the prayer to another Anglo-Saxon saint, St Botulf, and the generally Scandinavian context of the name.

A consideration of the sequence in which the names occur in the list of martyrs results in a solution entirely different from that proposed by Dvornik. The Magnus, placed just before St Canute Rex († 1086) or St Canute Dux († 1131) with St Olaf Haraldson, the most famous of the Scandinavian royal saints, soon after in a sequence which as a whole suggests a Scandinavian origin, can hardly be any other than St Magnus Erlendson, Earl of Orkney, martyred in 1115 and translated in 1135.²⁰

The identification of the next three names in the list of martyrs — Canute, Benedict, and Alban — is no less obvious at a time when we have just celebrated the ninth centenary of a Scandinavian 'Murder in the Cathedral'.

On 10 July 1086 the Danish King, Canute, fleeing from an uprising in Jutland, was slain in Odense 'in the church dedicated to the Holy

¹⁸ This group reads 'molite boga za mia greshnago sviatyi lik papezhiu [anklite] klimiante silivestre lve papa stefane georgie zinovie vlasie voiteshe vsi sviatii sviashchenomuchenitsi'. A scribe may have skipped either a line, or from one 'George' to another, when transcribing what was originally a separate group of Priest- and Bishop-Martyrs for which Zenobius, Blasius, and Voitekh-Adalbert all qualify: George qualifies for both groups.

¹⁹ Dvornik only comments on the double occurrence of Benedict in his 1954 essay (p. 326). In the first appearance, between Canute and Alban, Dvornik thinks he can be identified with either Benedict of Aniane († 821) or Benedict Biscop († 689) of Anglo-Saxon origin and founder of Wearmouth and Jarrow Abbeys, 'ces deux saint Benoit pourraient figurer dans la série des saints occidentaux, a côté de Magnus, Canut, Alban, Olaf et Botulf'. The second Benedict, appearing after Cyril and Methodius, Dvornik identifies as Benedict of Nursia.

²⁰ Magnús Már Lárusson in *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder*, 11, Copenhagen 1966, cols. 221–22; H. Thurston, D. Attwater, eds, *Butler's Lives of the Saints*, London, 1956, II, pp. 103–04 (16 April). An alternative identification would be St Magnus (F. 19 August) whose cult flourished in Italy. But, unless his position in the list is coincidental, which the preceding combination of SS Vitus and Wenceslas seems to disprove, that is hardly a feasible identification.

Martyr Alban, whom [i.e. whose relics] he himself shortly before had brought from England to Denmark' as *Tabula Othoniensis* (c. 1095) has it;²¹ with, adds the *Passio Sancti Kanuti Regis et Martiris* (1095–1100), 'his arms extended in the form of a cross he was pierced in the side by the point of a lance'.²²

Slain with him were his brother, 'by his name and the grace of martyrdom Benedictus' according to the *Tabula*,²³ and seventeen of his men. Undoubtedly, the *Tabula* considered both Canute and Benedict to be martyrs. St Canute's early *Passio*, presumably an enclosure with the application for papal approval of St Canute's translation (granted in 1099/1100) does not mention Benedict's killing and consequently does not offer any opinion on his status. This has been thought to be the result of a papal refusal to include Benedict in the canonization. Without papal consent, the argument ran, no cult could be allowed; and therefore *Passio*'s author was obliged to delete references to Benedict's slaying and any suggestion of his sanctity.

The *Passio*'s silence on the subject of Benedict's martyrdom is, however, more simply explained. According to Ælnoth, Benedict was killed later, outside the church. The *Passio*'s account, however, ends with the killing of Canute, in order not to distract attention from his martyrdom. Ælnoth, who, like the anonymous author of the *Passio*, was an Anglo-Saxon monk, included an account of the same events in his chronicle, *Gesta Swenomagni regis et filiorum eius et Passio Gloriosissimi Canuti regis et martyris* (c. 1120) and wanted to write a Danish history from Sven Estridson to its culmination with the translation of Canute. The events of 10 July 1086 after the killing of Canute were recounted to their logical conclusion, when the monks 'buried the bodies of the king and his brother in the church' and his men in the antechapel (atrium). Ælnoth had already asserted that all of Canute's co-fighters were martyrs.²⁴ A whole chapter on the gruesome slaughter of Benedict, probably somewhat embellished, follows.²⁵ It has bewildered scholars of Ælnoth to find Benedict inexplicably conveyed from the church to a nearby hospice where he was defencelessly killed when, according to

²¹ 'in basilica sancti Albani martyris per eum paulo ante de Anglia in Daciam transuerti', M.Cl. Gertz, ed., *Knud den Helliges martyrhistorie*, in *Festskrift udg. af Københavns Universitet*, Copenhagen, 1907, p. 2. *Tabula*'s text is supposed to have been engraved upon a plate placed in the shrine during the *elevatio* in 1095. The plate, found in 1582 and copied soon after, has since been lost.

²² 'nam crucis in modum manibus expansis ad altare sancti Albani martiris transfixus est in latere cuspidis mucrone', cf. Gertz, p. 20.

²³ 'Occisi sunt etiam ibidem cum eo frater eius nomine et gratia martyrii Benedictus . ac XVII sui commilitones', cf. Gertz, p. 4.

²⁴ '... duceque precipuo tam lapidibus (ut Stephano) tunso quam et telis (ut Sebastiano) saucio edes sacra tam eius quam et sociorum uulneratorum ac demum occisorum cruore perfunditur et, ut ita fatear, preciositate martyrii eorum iterato consecratur', M.Cl. Gertz, ed., *Vitae sanctorum Danorum*, Copenhagen, 1908–12, p. 118.

²⁵ *Vitae sanctorum Danorum*, pp. 124f.

Tabula's 'ibidem', and Saxo's and Knytlingasaga's later versions, he was killed fighting in the church. Whichever version is correct, Ælnoth's method made it possible for him to represent Benedict as martyr (i.e. not dying with a sword in his hand); and if it was indeed Ælnoth who manipulated his account, it only shows to what lengths he was prepared to go to depict Benedict in a manner conducive to his acceptance as martyr.²⁶ There is then no doubt that Ælnoth, c. 1120, as well as *Tabula*, c. 1095, considered Benedict a martyr, although his status in this world remained more modest than his brother's.

We have documentary evidence from later in the twelfth century in the form of King Valdemar I the Great's charter of immunity of 6 February 1180 to St Canute's Abbey, which expressed joy because the cathedral's holy relics included those of his forefathers. The plural form shows that the king must have thought not only of Canute but also of Benedict.²⁷ Finally, in a mid-thirteenth-century *Passio sancti Kanuti et martiris* Benedict is repeatedly referred to as Beatus and Sanctus, which further confirms the fact of his continuing veneration.²⁸

The cult of Benedict, then, is well-authenticated as coexisting with that of his brother St Canute from its inception until well into the thirteenth century.

While the cult of St Canute Rex prospered, only overshadowed for a brief period in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century by the cult of his nephew and founder of a new branch of the dynasty St Canute Dux († 1131, canonized 1170), we have little further information on the continuing medieval cult of St Benedict, apart from a few terse annals which all represent Benedict as a martyr alongside St Canute.²⁹ No literary monuments to Benedict comparable to St Canute's have been preserved, if they ever existed.

After the Danish Reformation of 1536 signs of the veneration of saints were destroyed, left to disintegrate, or tucked away. We know from Ælnoth that Canute was enshrined in a richly mounted shrine at the translation of 1100. Some time after the Reformation the shrine, with most of its silverplating removed to the exchequer, must have been walled up in a chapel. It was found in 1582, when the chapel was demolished: after the *Tabula* was removed it was walled up again, this

²⁶ The argument of Gertz, pp. 98f.

²⁷ 'quod uenerande sanctorum reliquie in ea [the cathedral] continentur quos sicuti nostros exstistisse propinquis. ita pios apud deum paternos esse gaudemus', cf. *Diplomatarium Danicum*, 1: 3, Copenhagen, 1976, no. 89, p. 133.

²⁸ 'At ipse, vulnere Christi non immemor, que pro nobis passus est, beato Benedicto, fratre suo carnali et certaminum collega, . . .' (Chapter vii, 3); 'Tandem beatum Benedictum, preciosi martiris et regis fratrem germanum conlegamque certaminis . . .' (Chapter vii, 6); ' . . . beatissimi regis et martiris Kanuti pariter et fratris ipsius, sancti Benedicti ducis, meritis et precibus miraculorum signa multiplicat' (Chapter viii, 2), cf. *Vitae sanctorum Danorum*, pp. 552–54.

²⁹ Erik Kroman, ed., *Danmarks middelalderlige annaler*, Copenhagen, 1980, pp. 55, 163, 256.

time in a niche behind the altar. In 1696 during a new investigation two similar shrines unexpectedly turned up. Drawings and engravings were duly made before they once more disappeared behind their walls, after being furnished with a note explaining that the skeletons were thought to be those of SS Canute and Alban. At their final re-emergence in 1833 they appeared as two rather bare wooden shrines of about 1.5 m. in length. The second shrine was first thought to be for St Alban, but it was eventually concluded to be Prince Benedict's.

In 1874 it was decided to restore the shrines and examine the skeletons. A commission of experts from several different fields was formed. The comprehensive publication which was envisaged, however, never appeared, as the members failed to agree, primarily on the identification of the second shrine: the historian argued in favour of Benedict, three archaeologists for St Alban. It was decided to publish some preliminary reports instead. The volume duly appeared in time for the eighth centenary and the public revelation of the argument (the editor sided with the archaeologists) immediately sparked off a heated discussion about the identification of the second shrine: was it devoted to Alban, or Benedict?

The main argument in favour of Alban was that the shrine was obviously made for a saint. Benedict had never received the papal canonization, which, both parties agreed,³⁰ was a prerequisite for the institution of the cult. Consequently, Benedict could not have been enshrined as a saint. Furthermore, the message in the *Tabula* ('in basilica sancti Albani martyris per eum [Canute] paulo ante de Anglia in Daciam transuectē') could be interpreted as if Canute had brought St Alban *in toto* from England. English monastic claims to possess the saint³¹ signified little as any monastery losing the remains could be

³⁰ Gertz, a strong adherent of the Benedict solution, even considered the enshrinement of Benedict to have been unlawful, and surmised it to have been clandestine; cf. Gertz, pp. 94 f.

³¹ In 1129 St Alban was translated in St Albans Abbey to a new shrine made by the monk goldsmith Anketil. Anketil had been to Denmark earlier (c. 1100–10) at the king's invitation and 'had there become a celebrated goldsmith and supervisor of the royal mint', cf. David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, Cambridge, 1950, pp. 188, 537; and *Gesta abbatum Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, *Rolls Series*, 28, 1, pp. 83–87. He may well have been involved in the construction of the Danish shrines. In any case he must have known about it if the English monks from Evesham Abbey, invited shortly before by the Danish king to form a daughter house at the Odense shrine, thought *they* possessed St Alban. The Abbey at Ely also laid claim to St Alban in 1077, which seems to reflect the fact that the saint was evacuated to Ely in 1044 in fear of a Danish–Norwegian attack. The later historical tradition (Matthew Paris) of St Albans Abbey even relates a Danish theft of the saint, his veneration in Odense and clandestine return to England. This was brought into the discussion in 1886 in favour of the St Alban solution, but was refuted by A. D. Jørgensen, 'Helgenskrinene i St. Knuds kirke II', *Aarbøger for nordisk oldkyndighed*, 1887, repr. in *Historiske Afhandlinger*, 11, Copenhagen, 1899, pp. 266 f.; cf. also Peter King, 'The Cathedral Priory of Odense in the Middle Ages', *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger*, 7, 6, Copenhagen, 1965–68, pp. 6 f. On the widespread practice of 'body-snatching' and that of St Alban in particular, cf. F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066. A Constitutional History*, London, 1963, pp. 175 f.

expected to cover up with a substitute. An anthropological examination revealed that the second skeleton was less well preserved, which could indicate a greater age.

Benedict's supporters thought it unlikely that Canute would have been able to acquire St Alban's complete skeleton during one of his two raids against England in 1069–70 and 1075, although on the former occasion the Danes did have the opportunity to plunder Ely, whither the relics are reported to have been evacuated in 1044.³² It was most likely, they thought, that Canute had peacefully acquired some small portion of the saint, a conclusion supported by Ælnoth's description of how the capsules (*capsulæ*) with the relics of SS Oswald and Alban were overturned during the fight in the church.³³ The term 'capsula' was hardly consistent with the presence of a complete skeleton. Furthermore, the difference in the ages of the two skeletons at the time of death, thirty-five to fifty years for the skeleton assumed to be Canute's, and twenty-two to twenty-five years for the other, was thought to support the view that the latter was indeed Canute's younger brother. The skeleton of Benedict had spent five or six more years in the earth (Canute was elevated in 1095, Benedict only in 1100), which accounted for its deteriorated state. Finally, it was pointed out that the Knytlinga-saga's detailed account of St Canute's translation explicitly states that the coffin containing Benedict was unearthed on the same occasion and since then Benedict 'rests in another shrine'.³⁴

No agreement could, however, be reached then or since, although the majority of historians proper are perhaps inclined towards Benedict as papal approval of eleventh to twelfth-century cults has been acknowledged to be unnecessary.

New examinations which began in 1981 and continued in 1985 have concentrated on the shrine and skeleton of Canute.³⁵ The scientific dating of the skeletons, which would at least exclude one of the alternatives, Alban or Benedict, has yet to be performed.

Even if modern uncertainty over the cults and shrines in medieval Odense is symptomatic of the close links between the three cults, it cannot, of course, be taken as proof of any such links. The evidence of

³² Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. A Revised Translation*, London, pp. 149 f. (E Text); and see the preceding note.

³³ *Vitae sanctorum Danorum*, p. 120.

³⁴ 'þá var ór jörðu tekin sú kista, er lík Benedikts, konungs bróður, hafði verit í lagt, . . . í qðru skríni hvílir Benedikt, konungs bróðir, í Öðinsey á Fjóni'; Carl af Petersens, Emil Olson, eds, *Sögur Danakonunga*, Copenhagen, 1919–25, pp. 184–85. Note that 'rests' (hvílir) is in the present tense.

³⁵ A dendrochronological dating of Canute's shrine was attempted and yielded the date 1048. As the outermost rings are lacking, the date is consistent with c. 1100 as the date of manufacture. For the information on the later history of the shrines, cf. Jens Vellev, 'Helgenskrinen i Odense — fund og forskning 1582–1986', in Tore Nyberg *et al.*, eds, *KNÜDS-BOGEN 1986. Studier over Knud den Hellige, Fynske studier* 15, Odense, 1986, pp. 123–56.

both an early cult of Benedict as martyr,³⁶ and the importance of the cult of the English protomartyr St Alban in the growth of Odense as a national centre for the cult of St Canute, are, however, sufficiently strong to support the conclusion that the sequence 'Canute, Benedict, Alban' in the prayer reflects the cults of the three martyrs at Odense.

Of the thirty names in the list of martyrs it seems impossible to identify only one with a known martyr.³⁷ That is Botulf, the last in the sequence of Scandinavian/Anglo-Saxon saints, Magnus, Canute, Benedict, Alban, Olaf, Botulf. The most likely explanation for his inclusion is that he was carried in the wake of St Olaf, without the author knowing exactly who this saint was.

The cult of St Botulf was not widespread outside England, but he became very popular in Scandinavia, where several churches were dedicated to him and his feast entered into a number of calendars. This popularity probably originated in the early period of the Scandinavian churches, when Anglo-Saxon influence was strong.³⁸ The cult of St Botulf was sometimes linked to that of St Olaf: a representation of St Olaf appears on the St Botulf Antependium of Årdal church in Norway.³⁹

There can be little doubt, then, that the sequence, Magnus, Canute, Benedict, Alban, Olaf, Botulf in the list of martyrs, originated in Scandinavia.⁴⁰ But is it still possible that it found its way to Russia via Bohemia? The suggestion is unlikely, and, if the identification of 'Magnus' with St Magnus of Orkney is correct, quite impossible. None of these saints was ever particularly venerated in Bohemia, and the Church Slavonic tradition of the Sázava Monastery certainly did not survive long enough for the monastery to be a likely mediator, for it was latinized in 1096/97.⁴¹ Even ignoring St Magnus († 1115), the cult of St Canute († 1086, *elevatio* 1095) would scarcely have been able to spread

³⁶ According to information received from Dr Nyberg, general opinion at the symposium held in Odense 7–8 July 1986 was in favour of the Benedict solution.

³⁷ The complete list reads, 'molite boga za mia greshnago sviatyi pervomucheniche khristov stefane (26/12), georgie (23/4), fedore (9/11), dmitree (8/10), i sviaty 40 (10/3), panteleimone (27/7) m frole i lavre (18/8), prokop'e (8/7), merkur'e (25/11), andreiu (19/8), eustrat'e (13/12), nikito (15/9), mino (11/11), khristofore (25/7), vite (15/6), viacheslave (28/9), magnushe (16/4), kanute (10/7), vendikte (10/7?), albane (22/6), alove (29/7), butulve (17/6), sozone (7/9), romane (18/11), anfime (27/4), maksime (11/5), borise i glebe (24/7), pankrat'e (12/5), vsi sviatii muchenitsi'. For several of the names alternative identifications exist.

³⁸ It is symptomatic that apart from a short general article on St Botulf in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, 2, Munich, 1983, col. 493, the only, somewhat larger, article on his regional veneration deals with Scandinavia, col. 493 f.

³⁹ M. Blindheim, 'St Olav — ein skandinavischer Oberheiliger', *Acta Visbyensia*, VI, Uddevalla, 1981, pp. 55–56.

⁴⁰ The absence of any of the royal Anglo-Saxon saints (Oswald, Edmund, Ethelred, Edward) in the prayer seems to confirm that SS Alban and Botulf came via Scandinavia and not directly from England.

⁴¹ Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions*, pp. 225–29.

that far before the solemn translation with papal approval, in 1100, gave it added impetus.

If we consider the litany in its entirety there are, apart from the relatively few saints already mentioned, no indications that the prayer could be of western origin. The concluding section of the litany, mentioning female saints, accords well with early Russian litanies, as far as the transmitted names are identifiable. Most of the saints mentioned are Early Christian virgins and martyrs common to the whole church, but we do find typical Russian Holy Myrrh-bearing Women (*sviatye mironositsi*) for SS Martha and Mary of Bethania, and — significantly in view of the suggested Bohemian origin — we do not find St Ludmila.

We must then conclude that the prayer is most likely to be an original Russian work compiled at a time when a Russian cleric still found it possible to include a variety of typically western saints — saints both old and new.

IV

By noting which early comparable Scandinavian saints were not adopted into the prayer, we may tentatively conclude when the sequence was transferred to Russia.

First among the omissions is the nephew of St Canute Rex, Canute Ericson, father of King Valdemar I the Great (1131–82). Canute was martyred on 7 January 1131 and solemnly translated in 1170 as St Canute Dux on an occasion when King Valdemar's son Canute was also crowned, a momentous event in twelfth-century Danish history. St Canute Dux soon outshone his uncle as patron saint of the royally-supported St Canute Guilds. These were closely connected with Danish, and perhaps Swedish, Baltic trade centred on Gotland.⁴² His cult, certainly known in late twelfth-century Novgorod, must have been known outside Novgorod too because of the strong dynastic links which existed between the Danish royal house and Russian princes. Canute Ericson was himself married to the Russian princess Ingeborg, daughter of the Novgorodian, and later Kievan prince, Mstislav-Harald Volodimerovich Monomakh († 1132) and his Swedish wife Christine.

⁴² Cf. the influential article by Lauritz Weibull, 'St Knut i Österled', *Scandia*, 17, Lund, 1946, repr. in his *Nordisk historia*, II, Lund, 1948, pp. 417–32, summarized in Hoffmann, *Die heiligen Könige*, p. 171; Hans T. Gilkær, 'In honore sancti Kanuti martyris. Konge og Knudsgilder i det 12. århundrede', *Scandia*, 46, Lund, 1980, pp. 121–61; J. Lind, 'Varæger nemcer og novgoroder år 1188. Hvor var Choržek og Novotoržec?', *Historisk tidskrift för Finland* 1981, Helsingfors, 1981, pp. 145–77. For the Swedish St Canute's guilds, cf. C. Wallin, *Knuts-gillena i det medeltida Sverige*, Lund, 1975; Klaus Friedland, ed., *Gilde und Korporation in den nordeuropäischen Städten des späten Mittelalters, Quellen und Darstellungen zur hansischen Geschichte*, NF XXIX, Cologne, 1984, pp. 29–40 (T. Nyberg), pp. 41–50 (K. Hørby).

Canute's and Ingeborg's posthumous son Valdemar was not only named after his great-grandfather, he was, according to the *Knytlunga-saga* (which in this case seems trustworthy), even born in Russia seven days after the killing of his father, and he spent his early childhood there.⁴³ Valdemar in turn married a Russian princess, Sophia, the daughter of Volodar Glebovich of Minsk, with whom we know they were still in contact in the 1170s.⁴⁴

⁴³ Sogur Danakonunga, p. 216. Helmold von Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum*, Darmstadt, 1973, p. 192, has another version. According to him Ingeborg had a bad dream the night before the murder, but was unable to restrain her husband from leaving; a typical literary topos. In Saxo (*Saxonis Gesta Danorum* 1, Copenhagen, 1931, p. 354) Ingeborg learns about the plot and also warns Canute in vain, but here she has to send her warning by letter. So, while according to Helmold husband and wife are together the night before the murder, according to Saxo they are apart. Curt Weibull (*Saxo, Kritiska undersökningar i Danmarks historia från Sven Estridsens död till Knut IV*, Lund, 1915, pp. 179–236) showed that Saxo depended on a Helmold-text and, with *Knytlunga*, a lost common source. The latter had to exist because the extensive text common to Saxo and *Knytlunga* showed no traces of influence from Helmold. In a dissertation (*Knytlunga. Sagaerne om Danmarks konger. Studier i äldre nordisk litteratur*, Copenhagen, 1946) Gustav Albeck attempted to demonstrate that the common source did not exist and that *Knytlunga* drew solely on Saxo, Books 14 to 16. His premises were, however, untenable and he failed to shake Weibull's basic argument that *Knytlunga* disclosed no traces of Helmold. In 1976 Weibull emphatically restated his position ('Knytlungasagan och Saxo', *Scandia* 42, Lund, 1976, pp. 179–239) and his arguments have since been supported by Rikke Malmros ('Blodgildet i Roskilde historiografisk belyst', *Scandia* 45, Lund, 1979, pp. 43–66). The present instance reinforces Weibull's model: Saxo obviously knew about the warning from Helmold, but from *Knytlunga*'s source he also knew that Ingeborg and Canute were not together. He had to remain silent, however, about Ingeborg's distance from her husband, to make a letter credible under the circumstances. *Knytlunga* is able to make the important distinction that when Ingeborg and Canute were married her father Mstislav was prince in Holmgård (Novgorod), but when Ingeborg in 1130–31 visits him talk is no longer of Holmgård, but Gardariki (Rus') in accordance with Mstislav's occupation of the Kievan throne at the time. Such a distinction could hardly have been made by a thirteenth-century compiler: this suggests *Knytlunga*'s veracity on this point. Furthermore, two Icelanders, both mentioned in *Knytlunga* as informants or sources, were present during the Civil War of 1146–57, the scald Einarr Skúlason and Atli Sveinsson. The latter was in Valdemar's entourage at the final battle in 1157 and is the most likely source of this particular piece of information.

⁴⁴ After N. de Baumgarten, 'Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides Russes', *Orientalia Christiana*, Rome, ix, 1927, 1, pp. 23–36 (based on his earlier study, 'Sofia Vladimirovna Koroleva Datskaia i zatem Landgrafinia Tiuringenskaia', *Letopis' Istorikoro-doslovnago obshchestva v Moskve*, vi, 1910, 1, pp. 24–30). Sophia's father is often given as the semi-mythical Novgorodian prince Vladimir Vsevolodich (cf. e.g. M. Hellmann's genealogical table in *Handbuch der Geschichte Russlands*, 1, Stuttgart, 1980, p. 428). In the sources he appears only when Novgorod adopted him as its child-prince for a few days in 1136, after expelling his father on 15 July and before receiving Sviatoslav Ol'govich on 19 July (it had been doubtful, whether 'a Volodimira, syna ego, priiasha' [*Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, Moscow, 1950, pp. 24, 209] meant held as 'prisoner' or 'prince', until V. L. Ianin [*Aktovye pečati* 1, Moscow, 1970, p. 110] identified seals as belonging to him). Scandinavian sources, which alone know of this marriage, agree in naming her father Valada, Valadar, Valadar or the like, while the same sources name Vladimir Sviatoslavich and Vladimir Monomakh as Valdimarr or Valdamarr, the same form as they use for Valdemar the Great. There can be no doubt that Sophia's father was a *Volodar*. Baumgarten arrived at his solution by considering the names Volodar and Volodimer interchangeable and assuming Sophia's father to have been dead before Richiza's next marriage. We now, however, know that he was still alive in the 1170s. Cf. the thorough study by Jarl Gallén, 'Vem var Valdemar den stores drottning Sofie', *Historisk tidskrift för Finland*, 1976, pp. 273–88. The prominent Scandinavianist, E. A. Rydzevskaia († 1941) in *Drevniaia Rus' i Skandinavia*, Moscow, 1978, p. 59, n. 85, also had no hesitation in identifying 'Valadr' with Volodar Glebovich.

Secondly, the Swedish King Eric Jedvardson, the third of the Scandinavian royal saints, is not included in the prayer. He was martyred in 1160 and his cult became established sometime between 1167, when his son Canute ascended the throne, and 1198, when his name is entered under 18 May in the Vallentuna Calendar.⁴⁵

Finally, considering the early spread to Denmark (not later than 1174)⁴⁶ and subsequent popularity of Thomas Becket's cult in Scandinavia we could also expect him to have been included in a list of 'Scandinavian' cults exported to Russia, if the transfer had taken place in the later part of the twelfth century.

The most likely date of the transfer to Russia, then, seems to be around the middle of the twelfth century.

The dynastic connections mentioned also provide the most likely medium through which the 'Scandinavian' cults found their way to Russia.

The murder of Mstislav Volodimerovich's son-in-law, Duke Canute Ericson, in 1131 by his cousin Magnus, son of the reigning king Niels, started a civil war which lasted until 1134. Then Duke Canute's half-brother Eric Ericson Emune, long on the defensive, won a decisive battle in Skåne. The battle cost Magnus and five bishops their lives, while King Niels fled to Duke Canute's former stronghold, Slesvig, where he was killed by the citizens. Once on the throne, Eric Emune soon started preparations for having his half-brother canonized and a *Life*, now lost, was written by Robert of Ely. The process was cut short when Eric himself was killed in 1137 and the archbishop Asser, the only bishop to support Eric against King Niels, died the same year.

In spite of its brevity, the reign of Eric Emune is the most likely period in which the transfer of the 'Scandinavian' cults to Russia can have taken place. The killing of Duke Canute must have made a great impression at Mstislav Volodimerovich's court in Kiev, particularly if his daughter was there giving birth to Duke Canute's posthumous son at the time.

The year 1135 not only saw the initial preparations for a cult of Canute Dux; it was also the year when the cult of Earl Magnus of Orkney was finally instituted on 13 December. Magnus had been killed in 1115 by his cousin Hakon, who then took sole possession of the Orkneys until his death in 1122. Later in the 1120s the Norwegian king Sigurd Jorsalfar helped Magnus's nephew Kale-Rognvald

⁴⁵ Toni Schmid, *Liber Ecclesiae Vallentunensis*, Stockholm, 1945, p. 87; Tore S. Nyberg, 'Eskil av Lund och Erik den helige', *Historia och samhälle, studier tillägnade Jerker Rosén*, Lund, 1975, pp. 5-21.

⁴⁶ John Lind, 'Til spørgsmålet om kongehuset og udbredelsen af Thomas Becket-kulten i Danmark', *ICO, Iconographisk post 1982*, Uppsala, 1982, pp. 38-39.

Kolsson to the earldom, and it was in support of his reign that the translation of St Magnus took place.

Cults often achieved their widest spread shortly after their institution, as otherwise some 'cult-event' was usually required to renew the initial impetus. There are, however, other reasons why Eric Emune's short reign is the most likely period for the fame of St Magnus to have reached Denmark and subsequently Russia. The new Earl of Orkney, Kale-Rognvald's royal supporter Sigurd Jorsalfar, died in 1130, leaving his widow Malmfrid free to marry Eric Emune. She was, however, also the sister of Duke Canute's wife Ingeborg, and consequently another daughter of Mstislav Volodimerovich and Christine.⁴⁷

During Eric Emune's reign, 1134–37, dynastic connections not only spread to Russia but also linked all the Scandinavian royal and princely saints included in the Russian prayer.

Although the transfer of the 'Scandinavian' cults is most likely to have followed dynastic links, the period also coincides with the only mention in Russian sources of direct commercial links between Denmark and Russia (Novgorod). The First Novgorod Chronicle s.a. 1130 relates that while a merchants' fleet from Gotland foundered, ships from Denmark returned safely. In 1134, however, we are told that the Novgorodians in Denmark were held prisoner, or, according to a more recent interpretation, had their commodities or valuables confiscated.⁴⁸ These passages should not be interpreted as indicating that trade between Denmark and Novgorod was particularly lively in this period, for they probably owe their inclusion in the Chronicle to the fact that, in both cases, something unusual happened. Uninterrupted trade probably continued throughout the century until the German Hansa gradually took over in the thirteenth century. It is, however, tempting to see the events described in 1134 as the direct result of the uprising of Eric Emune, who had Russian connections, against the reigning king. Eric's brother-in-law, Vsevolod Mstislavich, was after all still the reigning prince in Novgorod.

The next Russian–Scandinavian link, and the last in this period, is the marriage between Duke Canute's and Ingeborg Mstislavna's son, King Valdemar I the Great, and Sophia. She was a half-sister of Canute Magnusson, one of Valdemar's co-pretenders in the tri-partite struggle for the succession, which lasted from 1146 to 1157. Their betrothal took place in 1153, as part of a general conciliation, which abruptly broke down when the third contender, Sven Ericson, son of

⁴⁷ For the information on Danish history, cf. Aksel E. Christensen in *Danmarks historie*, 1, Copenhagen, 1977, pp. 275 f., 287 f.; on Magnus of Orkney, cf. Knut Helle, *Norge blir en stat 1130–1319*, Kristiansand, 1964, pp. 91 f.; on dynastic connections, cf. Jarl Gallén, *op. cit.*

⁴⁸ *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, pp. 22 f. For the new interpretation, which does not convince, cf. A. A. Zalizniak in his and V. L. Ianin's, *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste: iz raskopok 1977–1983 gg.*, Moscow, 1986, pp. 168 f.

Eric Emune, tried to have the other two killed at a gathering in 1157 but only managed to get rid of Canute. The wedding took place immediately, and with the combined forces Valdemar defeated Sven, who was killed soon after.⁴⁹

Canute Magnusson's parents were Magnus Nielsson, Duke Canute's murderer, and the Polish princess Richiza, daughter of Boleslaw III. After Magnus's death Richiza married the Russian prince, Volodar Glebovich, with whom she had her daughter Sophia. This marriage was apparently dissolved before the end of the 1140s, when she must have entered her third marriage with the Swedish king, Sverker I († 1155).

It could be assumed that, in view of her mother's early divorce, Sophia's Russian roots did not go deep. But from a miracle in William of Canterbury's collection of Thomas Becket's miracles we know that in the 1170s a messenger with gifts from her father was taken prisoner in Wendia, only to be released after praying to St Thomas. This information, which has come down to us quite by chance, indicates that contact may well have been regular throughout the period from the 1130s and may also have been a medium for the transfer of the 'Scandinavian' cults.⁵⁰

V

It was mentioned earlier that the prayer in the *Manuscript Description* of 1976 was attributed to St Kirill, Bishop of Turov (before 1169–before 1182) and renowned author of a number of religious literary works, the basis of his later canonization. While several writings are attributed to him with reasonable certainty, many more have been ascribed to him on insufficient grounds by medieval scribes and modern scholars alike. In the present case the reason for the attribution seems to be the already-quoted attribution, in some manuscripts, to 'Kirill philosopher and teacher of the Slavs and Bolgars'. Such an attribution would normally be interpreted as referring to St Cyril-Constantine. But as the prayer in its present form is obviously later and Cyril-Constantine is himself mentioned in it, it has been assumed that the original attribution to Kirill Turovskii by a later scribe was erroneously transferred to Cyril-Constantine.⁵¹ From chronological and geographical points of view Kirill Turovskii must certainly be considered one of the more

⁴⁹ Aksel E. Christensen, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

⁵⁰ Jarl Gallén, *op. cit.*; John Lind, *op. cit.*

⁵¹ This assumption was, in the opinion of Dr Ol'ga Petrovna Likhacheva, co-editor of the *Manuscript Description* (see note 14), to whom I am indebted for looking into the matter, the reason for the attribution to Kirill Turovskii in the *Description*.

likely candidates for the authorship of such a prayer. But the substantiation of such an attribution must depend on a textual-literary analysis outside the scope of this article. We should bear in mind the possibility that the prayer itself may well be much older than individual elements, such as names of saints in a litany, which could be substitutions or interpolations. The substitution in Shliapkin's fragment is an example. The catalogue of names would then not necessarily preclude authorship by Cyril-Constantine, or indeed John Chrysostom. In this context the original authorship is not important: the prayer, with its catalogue of saints, is significant for its demonstration that a Russian cleric, probably working towards the middle of the twelfth century, still found it acceptable to include a number of western saints in his litany. In doing so he must have relied on different sources; the West Slavonic saints could scarcely have originated in Scandinavia, whereas the list of popes could have accompanied either category, although it is just as likely to have been available to the author independently.⁵²

The prayer's contents demonstrate that Dvornik was correct in his assertion that the formal schism of 1054 was slower to effect the severance of contacts between East and West than was once thought: slower, even, than Dvornik thought. The effect of the schism probably varied from region to region, depending on the distance from, and frequency of contacts with, its two focal points, Constantinople and Rome. In Russia the relative strength of the Greek clergy in the various dioceses must have been significant. In Scandinavia, the militant spirit arising in the wake of the Second Crusade contributed to a major shift in mental attitude towards the eastern, Orthodox neighbours.⁵³

In the middle of the twelfth century that militancy turned towards the Baltic area, eventually breaking up the Scandinavian-Slavonic symbiosis developed in the melting pot of the Viking Age. For at least two centuries this symbiosis had made it natural to Slavs and Scandinavians to seek support from and refuge with one another, creating a host of dynastic alliances of which we now have only fragmentary knowledge. The marriage between Valdemar I the Great and Sophia was, however, the last Russian-Scandinavian royal marriage in this period of which we have knowledge — and we may question whether it is aptly termed *Russian* since it was primarily the result of a shift in internal Danish alliances.

⁵² The inclusion of the popes is perhaps not that surprising. The cults of the popes mentioned were all well-established before the Seventh Ecumenical Council. The *Povest' vremennykh let* not only names the popes participating in the first seven councils, but even ranks them before the eastern patriarchs. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, 1, 2nd edn, Moscow, 1962, col. 115.

⁵³ Tore Nyberg, 'Deutsche, dänische und schwedische Christianisierungsversuche östlich der Ostsee im Geiste des 2. und 3. Kreuzzuges', in Z. H. Nowak, ed., *Die Rolle der Ritterorden in der Christianisierung und Kolonisierung des Ostseegebietes*, Toruń, 1983, pp. 93–114 (= *Ordines militares: Colloquia Torunensia Historica*, 1).

Towards the end of the twelfth century, Scandinavians more and more often counted Russia among their heathen neighbours along the Baltic coast, against which it was legitimate to arrange crusades. A similar change in attitude took place at the same time in Russia, where the ethnic names for the Scandinavian neighbours started to be replaced by the religious, and derogatory, term *nemtsy*.⁵⁴ The first recorded instance seems to be in the First Novgorod Chronicle s.a. 1188, when Novgorodians were either imprisoned or had their goods confiscated in Sweden.⁵⁵ Novgorodians no longer thought of their western neighbours in terms of their ethnicity, but of their religion, as representatives of the Latin Church. By now the schism had obviously placed the Russians in the Greek camp and the Scandinavians in the Latin camp as far as the other party was concerned, when only recently a Russian cleric could accept western saints.

The fact that this particular prayer does not originate in Bohemia does not, of course, disprove Dvornik's (and before him, Sobolevskii's) thesis of Bohemian literary influence in the late eleventh century, based on other Russian religious texts. Still, our findings suggest that if such a text could in fact have been composed in twelfth-century Russia, the whole question of an influx of western influence to Russia via Bohemia should perhaps be subjected to a closer scrutiny than Sobolevskii and Dvornik found necessary.

⁵⁴ The term *Nemtsy* seems to find its origin and explanation in Cyrillo-Methodian times, when it was used to denote the Latin clergy opposing the introduction of the vernacular Slavonic liturgy. Compare the use of *Nemtsy* in Chapter x of Methodius's *Life* with Chapter xvi in Cyril-Constantine's *Life*, in which Cyril discusses with the adherents of the trilingual doctrine, cf. F. Grivec, F. Tomšič, eds, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicensis. Fontes*, Zagreb, 1960, pp. 134 f., 160. From Cyril's answer to those — *in casu* the Latin clergy — who insisted that God should only be worshipped in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, '[why do you condemn] all other tongues and tribes to be blind and deaf', it is only a short step to label those, like the Latin clergy, who could not speak to God in their own language 'the dumb ones', that is, *Nemtsy*. Early Russian usage confirms the religious content of the term: *Nemtsy* come from Rome, sent from the Pope to propagate the western rite, and are contrasted with similar Muslim, Jewish and Greek embassies (s.a. 986); and s.a. 987 Vladimir reciprocates with embassies to the Bulgars, *Nemtsy* and Greeks, cf. *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, pp. 132 f., 148 f.

⁵⁵ John Lind, 'Varæger, nemcer op novgoroder år 1188', pp. 145–65 (see note 42); V. L. Iain, A. A. Zalizniak, op. cit. (note 48).